

Title	Vanishing S-curvature of Randers spaces
Author(s)	Ohta, Shin-ichi
Citation	Differential Geometry and its Applications (2011), 29(2): 174-178
Issue Date	2011-03
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2433/139533
Right	© 2010 Elsevier B.V.
Type	Journal Article
Textversion	author

Vanishing S-curvature of Randers spaces

Shin-ichi OHTA*

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Kyoto University,
Kyoto 606-8502, JAPAN (e-mail: sohta@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp)

December 31, 2010

Abstract

We give a necessary and sufficient condition on a Randers space for the existence of a measure for which Shen's **S**-curvature vanishes everywhere. Moreover, if it exists, such a measure coincides with the Busemann-Hausdorff measure up to a constant multiplication.

Keywords: Randers spaces, **S**-curvature, Ricci curvature

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 53C60

1 Introduction

This short article is concerned with a characterization of Randers spaces admitting measures with vanishing **S**-curvature. A Randers space (due to Randers [Ra]) is a special kind of Finsler manifold (M, F) whose Finsler structure $F : TM \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is written as $F(v) = \alpha(v) + \beta(v)$, where α is a norm induced from a Riemannian metric on M and β is a one-form on M . Randers spaces are important in applications and reasonable for concrete calculations. See [AIM] and [BCS, Chapter 11] for more on Randers spaces.

We equip a Finsler manifold (M, F) with an arbitrary smooth measure m . Then the **S**-curvature $\mathbf{S}(v) \in \mathbb{R}$ of $v \in TM$ introduced by Shen (see [Sh, §7.3]) measures the difference between m and the volume measure of the Riemannian structure induced from the tangent vector field of the geodesic η with $\dot{\eta}(0) = v$ (see §2.2 for the precise definition). The author's recent work [Oh], [OS] on the weighted Ricci curvature (in connection with optimal transport theory) shed new light on the importance of this quantity.

A natural and important question arising from the theory of weighted Ricci curvature is: when does (M, F) admit a measure m with $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$? If such a measure exists, then we can choose it as a good reference measure. Our main result provides a complete answer to this question for Randers spaces.

Theorem 1.1 *A Randers space (M, F) admits a measure m with $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$ if and only if β is a Killing form of constant length. Moreover, then m coincides with the Busemann-Hausdorff measure up to a constant multiplication.*

*Supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) 20740036.

It has been observed by Shen [Sh, Example 7.3.1] that a Randers space with the Busemann-Hausdorff measure satisfies $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$ if β is a Killing form of constant length. Our theorem asserts that his condition on β is also necessary for the existence of m with $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$, and then it immediately follows that m must be a constant multiplication of the Busemann-Hausdorff measure.

On the one hand, Shen's result (the "if" part of Theorem 1.1) ensures that there is a rich class of non-Riemannian Randers spaces satisfying $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$. On the other hand, the "only if" part says that the class of general Randers spaces is much wider and many Randers spaces have no measures with $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$. This means that there are no canonical (reference) measures on such Finsler manifolds (in respect of the weighted Ricci curvature). Therefore, for a general Finsler manifold, it is natural to start with an arbitrary measure, as was discussed in [Oh] and [OS].

2 Preliminaries for Finsler geometry

We first review the basics of Finsler geometry. Standard references are [BCS] and [Sh]. We will follow the notations in [BCS] with a little change (e.g., we use v^i instead of y^i).

2.1 Finsler structures

Let M be a connected n -dimensional C^∞ -manifold with $n \geq 2$, and $\pi : TM \rightarrow M$ be the natural projection. Given a local coordinate $(x^i)_{i=1}^n : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ of an open set $U \subset M$, we will always denote by $(x^i; v^i)_{i=1}^n$ the local coordinate of $\pi^{-1}(U)$ given by $v = \sum_i v^i (\partial/\partial x^i)|_{\pi(v)}$.

A C^∞ -Finsler structure is a function $F : TM \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (I) F is C^∞ on $TM \setminus \{0\}$;
- (II) $F(cv) = cF(v)$ for all $v \in TM$ and $c \geq 0$;
- (III) The $n \times n$ matrix

$$g_{ij}(v) := \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial(F^2)}{\partial v^i \partial v^j}(v)$$

is positive-definite for all $v \in TM \setminus \{0\}$.

The positive-definite matrix $(g_{ij}(v))$ defines a Riemannian structure g_v of $T_x M$ through

$$g_v \left(\sum_i a^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}, \sum_j b^j \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \right) := \sum_{i,j} g_{ij}(v) a^i b^j. \quad (2.1)$$

Note that $g_v(v, v) = F(v)^2$. This inner product g_v is regarded as the best approximation of $F|_{T_x M}$ in the direction v . Indeed, the unit sphere of g_v is tangent to that of $F|_{T_x M}$ at $v/F(v)$ up to the second order. If (M, F) is Riemannian, then g_v always coincides with the original Riemannian metric. As usual, (g^{ij}) will stand for the inverse matrix of (g_{ij}) .

We define the *Cartan tensor*

$$A_{ijk}(v) := \frac{F(v)}{2} \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial v^k}(v)$$

for $v \in TM \setminus \{0\}$, and remark that $A_{ijk} \equiv 0$ holds if and only if (M, F) is Riemannian. We also define the *formal Christoffel symbol*

$$\gamma^i_{jk}(v) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_l g^{il}(v) \left\{ \frac{\partial g_{lj}}{\partial x^k}(v) + \frac{\partial g_{kl}}{\partial x^j}(v) - \frac{\partial g_{jk}}{\partial x^l}(v) \right\}$$

for $v \in TM \setminus \{0\}$. Then the geodesic equation is written as $\ddot{\eta} + G(\dot{\eta}) = 0$ with the *geodesic spray coefficients*

$$G^i(v) := \sum_{j,k} \gamma^i_{jk}(v) v^j v^k$$

for $v \in TM$ ($G^i(0) := 0$ by convention). Using these, we further define the *nonlinear connection*

$$N^i_j(v) := \sum_k \left\{ \gamma^i_{jk}(v) v^k - \frac{1}{F(v)} A^i_{jk}(v) G^k(v) \right\}$$

for $v \in TM$ ($N^i_j(0) := 0$ by convention), where $A^i_{jk}(v) := \sum_l g^{il}(v) A_{ljk}(v)$. Note that (see [BCS, Exercise 2.3.3])

$$N^i_j(v) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial G^i}{\partial v^j}(v).$$

2.2 S-curvature and weighted Ricci curvature

We choose an arbitrary positive C^∞ -measure m on a Finsler manifold (M, F) . Fix a unit vector $v \in F^{-1}(1)$ and let $\eta : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow M$ be the geodesic with $\dot{\eta}(0) = v$. Along η , the tangent vector field $\dot{\eta}$ defines the Riemannian metric $g_{\dot{\eta}}$ via (2.1). Denoting the volume form of $g_{\dot{\eta}}$ by $\text{vol}_{\dot{\eta}}$, we decompose m into $m(dx) = e^{-\Psi(\dot{\eta})} \text{vol}_{\dot{\eta}}(dx)$ along η . Then we define the **S-curvature** of v by

$$\mathbf{S}(v) := \frac{d(\Psi \circ \dot{\eta})}{dt}(0).$$

We extend this definition to all $w = cv$ with $c \geq 0$ by $\mathbf{S}(w) := c\mathbf{S}(v)$. Clearly $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$ holds on Riemannian manifolds with the volume measure.

The *weighted Ricci curvature* is defined in a similar manner as follows:

- (i) $\text{Ric}_n(v) := \text{Ric}(v) + (\Psi \circ \dot{\eta})''(0)$ if $\mathbf{S}(v) = 0$, $\text{Ric}_n(v) := -\infty$ otherwise;
- (ii) $\text{Ric}_N(v) := \text{Ric}(v) + (\Psi \circ \dot{\eta})''(0) - \mathbf{S}(v)^2/(N - n)$ for $N \in (n, \infty)$;
- (iii) $\text{Ric}_\infty(v) := \text{Ric}(v) + (\Psi \circ \dot{\eta})''(0)$.

Here $\text{Ric}(v)$ is the usual (unweighted) Ricci curvature of v . The author [Oh] shows that bounding Ric_N from below by $K \in \mathbb{R}$ is equivalent to the curvature-dimension condition $\text{CD}(K, N)$, and then there are many analytic and geometric applications. Observe that the bound $\text{Ric}_n \geq K > -\infty$ makes sense only when the **S-curvature** vanishes everywhere.

Therefore the class of such special triples (M, F, m) deserves a particular interest. We remark that, if there are two measures m_1, m_2 on (M, F) satisfying $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$, then $m_1 = c \cdot m_2$ holds for some positive constant c .

We rewrite $\mathbf{S}(v)$ according to [Sh, §7.3] for ease of later calculation. Recall that η is the geodesic with $\dot{\eta}(0) = v$. Fix a local coordinate $(x^i)_{i=1}^n$ containing η and represent m along η as

$$m(dx) = \sigma(\eta) dx^1 dx^2 \cdots dx^n = \frac{\sigma(\eta)}{\sqrt{\det(g_{\dot{\eta}})}} \text{vol}_{\dot{\eta}}(dx).$$

We have by definition

$$\mathbf{S}(v) = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \log \left(\frac{\sqrt{\det(g_{\dot{\eta}(t)})}}{\sigma(\eta(t))} \right) = \frac{1}{2 \det(g_v)} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} [\det(g_{\dot{\eta}(t)})] - \sum_i \frac{v^i}{\sigma(x)} \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x^i}(x).$$

Since η solves the geodesic equation $\ddot{\eta} + G(\dot{\eta}) = 0$, the first term is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k} \left\{ g^{ij}(v) \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x^k}(v) v^k + g^{ij}(v) \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial v^k}(v) \ddot{\eta}^k(0) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i,k} \left\{ \gamma^i_{ik}(v) v^k - \frac{1}{F(v)} A^i_{ik}(v) G^k(v) \right\} = \sum_i N^i_i(v). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\mathbf{S}(v) = \sum_i \left\{ N^i_i(v) - \frac{v^i}{\sigma(x)} \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x^i}(x) \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Observe that $\mathbf{S}(cv) = c\mathbf{S}(v)$ indeed holds for $c \geq 0$ in this form.

2.3 Busemann-Hausdorff measure and Berwald spaces

Different from the Riemannian case, there are several constructive measures on a Finsler manifold, each of them is canonical in some sense and coincides with the volume measure for Riemannian manifolds. Among them, here we treat only the Busemann-Hausdorff measure which is actually the Hausdorff measure associated with the suitable distance structure if F is symmetric in the sense that $F(-v) = F(v)$ holds for all $v \in TM$.

Roughly speaking, the Busemann-Hausdorff measure is the measure such that the volume of the unit ball of each tangent space equals the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n . Precisely, using a basis $w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n \in T_x M$ and its dual basis $\theta^1, \theta^2, \dots, \theta^n \in T_x^* M$, the *Busemann-Hausdorff measure* $m_{BH}(dx) = \sigma_{BH}(x) \theta^1 \wedge \theta^2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \theta^n$ is defined as

$$\frac{\omega_n}{\sigma_{BH}(x)} = \text{vol}_n \left(\left\{ (c^i) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid F \left(\sum_i c^i w_i \right) < 1 \right\} \right),$$

where vol_n is the Lebesgue measure and ω_n is the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n .

Let (M, F) be a *Berwald space* (see [BCS, Chapter 10] for the precise definition). Then it is well known that $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$ holds for the Busemann-Hausdorff measure (see [Sh, Proposition 7.3.1]). In fact, along any geodesic $\eta : [0, l] \rightarrow M$, the parallel transport $T_{0,t} : T_{\eta(0)} M \rightarrow T_{\eta(t)} M$ with respect to $g_{\dot{\eta}}$ preserves F . Therefore choosing parallel vector fields along η as a basis yields that σ_{BH} is constant on η , which yields $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let (M, F) be a Randers space, i.e., $F(v) = \alpha(v) + \beta(v)$ such that α is a norm induced from a Riemannian metric and that β is a one-form. In a local coordinate $(x^i)_{i=1}^n$, we can write

$$\alpha(v) = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(x) v^i v^j}, \quad \beta(v) = \sum_i b_i(x) v^i$$

for $v \in T_x M$. The *length* of β at x is defined by $\|\beta\|(x) := \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} a^{ij}(x) b_i(x) b_j(x)}$, which is necessarily less than 1 in order to guarantee $F > 0$ on $TM \setminus \{0\}$.

We denote the Christoffel symbol of (a_{ij}) by $\tilde{\gamma}^i_{jk}$. We also define

$$b^i(x) := \sum_j a^{ij}(x) b_j(x), \quad b_{i|j}(x) := \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial x^j}(x) - \sum_k b_k(x) \tilde{\gamma}^k_{ij}(x).$$

Note that $b_{i|j}$ is the coefficient of the covariant derivative $\tilde{\nabla}$ of β with respect to α , namely $\tilde{\nabla}_{\partial/\partial x^j} \beta = \sum_i b_{i|j} dx^i$. We find by calculation that

$$\frac{\partial(\|\beta\|^2)}{\partial x^i}(x) = 2 \sum_j b_{j|i}(x) b^j(x). \quad (3.1)$$

We say that β is a *Killing form* if $b_{i|j} + b_{j|i} \equiv 0$ holds on M . The geodesic spray coefficients of F are given by (see [BCS, (11.3.11)])

$$\begin{aligned} G^i(v) &= \sum_{j,k} \gamma^i_{jk}(v) v^j v^k \\ &= \sum_{j,k} \left[\tilde{\gamma}^i_{jk}(x) v^j v^k + b_{j|k}(x) (a^{ij}(x) v^k - a^{ik}(x) v^j) \alpha(v) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + b_{j|k}(x) \frac{v^i}{F(v)} \{ v^j v^k + (b^k(x) v^j - b^j(x) v^k) \alpha(v) \} \right] \\ &=: \sum_{j,k} \tilde{\gamma}^i_{jk}(x) v^j v^k + X^i(v) + Y^i(v). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

If $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$ on $T_x M$, then we deduce from (2.2) that $\sum_i N^i_i(v)$ is linear in $v \in T_x M$. We shall see that only this infinitesimal constraint is enough to imply the condition on β stated in Theorem 1.1. To see this, we calculate $2N^i_i = \partial G^i / \partial v^i$ using (3.2). As the first term $\sum_{j,k} \tilde{\gamma}^i_{jk}(x) v^j v^k$ comes from a Riemannian structure, it suffices to consider only the linearly of $\sum_i \{ \partial X^i / \partial v^i(v) + \partial Y^i / \partial v^i(v) \}$. For the sake of simplicity, we will omit evaluations at x and v in the following calculations.

We first obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \frac{\partial X^i}{\partial v^i} &= \sum_{i,j} (b_{j|i} - b_{i|j}) a^{ij} \alpha + \sum_{i,j,k,l} b_{j|k} (a^{ij} v^k - a^{ik} v^j) \frac{a_{il} v^l}{\alpha} \\ &= \sum_{i,j} b_{j|i} (a^{ij} - a^{ji}) \alpha + \sum_{j,k} b_{j|k} (v^k v^j - v^j v^k) \alpha^{-1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

As Euler's theorem [BCS, Theorem 1.2.1] ensures

$$\sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \left(\frac{v^i}{F} \right) = \frac{1}{F^2} \sum_i \left(F - v^i \frac{\partial F}{\partial v^i} \right) = \frac{n-1}{F},$$

we next observe

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \frac{\partial Y^i}{\partial v^i} &= \sum_{i,j} \frac{v^i}{F} \left\{ (b_{i|j} + b_{j|i})v^j + (b_{i|j} - b_{j|i})b^j \alpha + \sum_{k,l} b_{j|k} (b^k v^j - b^j v^k) \frac{a_{il} v^l}{\alpha} \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{n-1}{F} \sum_{j,k} b_{j|k} \{ v^j v^k + (b^k v^j - b^j v^k) \alpha \} \\ &= \frac{n+1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (b_{i|j} + b_{j|i}) \frac{v^i v^j}{F} + (n+1) \sum_{i,j} (b_{i|j} - b_{j|i}) b^j \frac{\alpha v^i}{F}. \end{aligned}$$

By comparing the evaluations at v and $-v$, the coefficients $b_{i|j} + b_{j|i}$ in the first term must vanish for all i, j , and hence β is a Killing form. For the second term, we find that $(\alpha/F) \sum_j (b_{i|j} - b_{j|i}) b^j$ must be constant on each $T_x M$. If α/F is not constant on some $T_x M$ (i.e., $\|\beta\|(x) \neq 0$), then it holds that $\sum_j (b_{i|j} - b_{j|i}) b^j = 0$. Since β is a Killing form, we deduce from (3.1) that

$$0 = \sum_j (b_{i|j} - b_{j|i}) b^j = -2 \sum_j b_{j|i} b^j = -\frac{\partial(\|\beta\|^2)}{\partial x^i}.$$

Therefore β has a constant length as required, for $\|\beta\| \neq 0$ is an open condition. If α/F is constant on some $T_x M$, then the above argument yields that $\beta \equiv 0$ on M . This completes the proof of the “only if” part of Theorem 1.1.

For the “if” part, it is sufficient to show that the Busemann-Hausdorff measure satisfies $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$, that can be found in [Sh, Example 7.3.1]. We briefly repeat his discussion for completeness. We first observe from [Sh, (2.10)] that

$$m_{BH}(dx) = (1 - \|\beta\|(x)^2)^{(n+1)/2} \sqrt{\det(a_{ij}(x))} dx^1 \cdots dx^n =: \sigma_{BH}(x) dx^1 \cdots dx^n.$$

Since β has a constant length, we have

$$\sum_k \frac{v^k}{\sigma_{BH}(x)} \frac{\partial \sigma_{BH}}{\partial x^k}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k} v^k a^{ij}(x) \frac{\partial a_{ij}}{\partial x^k}(x) = \sum_{i,j} \tilde{\gamma}^i_{ij}(x) v^j.$$

Therefore we conclude, by (2.2),

$$\mathbf{S}(v) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k} \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \left[\tilde{\gamma}^i_{jk}(x) v^j v^k \right] - \sum_k \frac{v^k}{\sigma_{BH}(x)} \frac{\partial \sigma_{BH}}{\partial x^k}(x) = 0.$$

□

We finally remark related known results and several consequences of Theorem 1.1.

Remark 3.1 (a) A Randers space is a Berwald space if and only if β is *parallel* in the sense that $b_{i|j} \equiv 0$ for all i, j (see [BCS, Theorem 11.5.1]). Thanks to [Sh, Example 7.3.2], we know that a Killing form of constant length is not necessarily parallel.

(b) In [De], Deng gives a characterization of vanishing \mathbf{S} -curvature for homogeneous Randers spaces endowed with the Busemann-Hausdorff measure.

(c) It is easy to construct a Randers space whose β does not have a constant length. Hence many Finsler manifolds do not admit measures with $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$ (in other words, with $\text{Ric}_n \geq K > -\infty$).

(d) Another consequence of Theorem 1.1 is that only (constant multiplications of) the Busemann-Hausdorff measures can satisfy $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$ on Randers spaces. Then a natural question is the following:

Question *Is there a Finsler manifold (M, F) on which some measure m other than (a constant multiplication of) the Busemann-Hausdorff measure satisfies $\mathbf{S} \equiv 0$? If yes, what kind of measure is m ?*

If such a measure exists, then it is more natural than the Busemann-Hausdorff measure in respect of the weighted Ricci curvature.

References

- [AIM] P. L. Antonelli, R. S. Ingarden and M. Matsumoto, *The theory of sprays and Finsler spaces with applications in physics and biology*, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1993.
- [BCS] D. Bao, S.-S. Chern and Z. Shen, *An introduction to Riemann-Finsler geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [De] S. Deng, *The S-curvature of homogeneous Randers spaces*, Differential Geom. Appl. **27** (2009), 75–84.
- [Oh] S. Ohta, *Finsler interpolation inequalities*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **36** (2009), 211–249.
- [OS] S. Ohta and K.-T. Sturm, *Heat flow on Finsler manifolds*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **62** (2009), 1386–1433.
- [Ra] G. Randers, *On an asymmetrical metric in the four-space of general relativity*, Phys. Rev. (2) **59** (1941), 195–199.
- [Sh] Z. Shen, *Lectures on Finsler geometry*, World Scientific Publishing Co., Singapore, 2001.